### Public Health K

#### The discourse of outlawing guns for their general welfare to society is a biopolitical grasp at de-rationalizing citizens and making decisions for them.

Protevi 12 John Protevi (Ph.D. in philosophy from Loyola University Chicago in 1990) “A Foucaultian analysis of framing gun violence as a public health issue” December 21st 2012 New Apps <http://www.newappsblog.com/2012/12/gun-violence-as-a-public-health-issue-and-the-neoliberal-management-of-risk.html> JW

I'm always on the lookout when things are phrased in "public health" terms as some of the talking heads do with gun control, as the public health vs individual health question is one of the key points of Foucault's notion of biopower. Now Foucault's work in the late 70s (e.g., Security, Territory, Population and Birth of Biopolitics) brings risk into the story he was constructing of "governmental rationalities." (Governmentality is the "conduct of conduct," that is, the way in which individuals are taught / encouraged / induced to manage their lives as various types of "subjects," as "sexual subjects," for instance, or in neoliberalism as "self-entrepreneurs" [hence the interest in Becker's human capital theory].) In the angle relevant here, he tried to theorize the way neoliberal governments try to get folks to manage risk / reward calculations individually for the most part (a huge change in American society occured with the "Great Risk Shift" toward individual finance decisions), but still maintain the ability to step in to do it when the overall risks and / or the informational asymmetries are too great. So you get to read ingredient labels so you can judge the risks of your individual food consumption patterns (that is, the government requires that you have access to certain bits of information so you can judge your risks), but non-physicians can't prescribe drugs as they are deemed unable to make the proper risk / reward calculations. So here governments manage individual health decisions. The intersection of individual and public health occurs with infectious disease. So the government can demand vaccination for entry to public school, because individuals don't have the information to be able to judge the risks of sending kids to a school in which some of the kids are not vaccinated since you don't know how many are not vaccinated and you don't know which vaccines they've skipped. So with guns, the public health rationality would be that you can't judge the risk of living next to somebody with a huge arsenal, because you don't know its contents or your neighbors training. So the government can manage that for you under the rubric of public health, either by outlawing certain types of guns (on the model of certain drugs that are too dangerous) or by requiring training and registration (on the model of requiring vaccination).

#### Rejection of biopower is an ethical obligation—humans are called to act independently of normalizing structures.

Diprose 9, Rosalyn. TOWARD AN ETHICO-POLITICS OF THE POSTHUMAN: FOUCAULT AND MERLEAU-PONTY. PARRHESIA NUMBER 8 • 2009 • 7–19. [www.parrhesiajournal.org/parrhesia08/parrhesia08\_diprose.pdf](http://www.parrhesiajournal.org/parrhesia08/parrhesia08_diprose.pdf) NP

The first aspect of Merleau-Ponty’s ontology to consider is the relation he posits between socio-political norms, scientific knowledge, and corporeal “life.” Merleau-Ponty, in his lectures on Nature, says that socio-political meaning is not imposed on material “life” (human or non-human) by a perceiving subject and, yet, it “is only within the perceived world that we can understand that all corporeality is already a symbolism.”27 He is not replacing “agency” centred on human consciousness, will, or reason, with agency centred on a (symbolised and symbolising) corporeality (or human body) that thereby governs its world from which it stands apart. MerleauPonty’s ontology is directed toward overturning this distinction between subject and object, immanence and transcendence, interiority and exteriority, and the related distinction between culture and nature. We cannot assume either that cultural meaning is imposed on “nature,” as some forms of idealism or “social constructionism” have it, or that, conversely, “nature” (or even technical devices) determines “culture” (which would be naturalism or realism). As Leonard Lawlor explains, referring to Merleau-Ponty’s lecture notes on Nature, 28 Merleau-Ponty advocates neither the separation nor the coincidence of these extremes of idealism parrhesiajournal.org 13 ROSALYN DIPROSE and realism, culture and nature; rather, “there must be ‘a hiatus’ un écart,” or an intertwining of the “two.”29 So with Merleau-Ponty we find that the meaning of “life,” while always socio-political and historical, is actualised and lived by human bodies entwined with other elements of “life.” “Corporeality is already a symbolism” and already technological without meaning being simply imposed on biological processes or on sensible “nature” by either a socio-political order that comes before us, or by one’s own conceptualising consciousness. Second, on the issue of docility and political subjection with respect to perception and “agency”: MerleauPonty claims that it is “possible to speak of passivity” with respect to a person’s relation to her environment, cultural milieu, or past, providing we do not equate “activity” or “agency” with consciousness or “will” and “only on the condition that ‘to be conscious’ does not mean ‘to give a meaning,’ which one projects onto an ungraspable object of knowledge.”30 But nor should passivity be understood simply in terms of compliance with outside forces, a formulation that then views political “agency” as a struggle against those forces.31 For Merleau-Ponty, within the hiatus of meaning, human and non-human “life,” human life “continues a vortex of experience which was set up at our birth, at the point of contact between the ‘outside’ and he who is called to live it.”32 While, like Foucault, for Merleau-Ponty, this “point of contact” with the “outside” is a body, MerleauPonty’s body is not an assemblage of active forces and powers in a relation of struggle with the powers of normalisation that would tame it. Rather, the human body is “called to live” by elements that are not itself: this is a “non-decisionary project” where I am “inspired” and “overcome” by the “thickness of the sensible,” which may include technical devices.33 But, in this project of living, the body is neither simply active or passive, dominating or docile, in relation to the “outside” that calls it to live, whether the “outside” is understood as the norms and meanings embedded in forces of governmentality, consciousness, asthma inhalers, or the rest of material life. This is because, as Merleau-Ponty puts it later in The Visible and the Invisible, there is a “double belongingness” to human “life:” “the body sensed and the body sentient” are “two phases” of “flesh,” and between the world and my body “there is reciprocal insertion and intertwining of one in the other.”34 Hence, as perception or experience is “a feeling that is felt”, a seeing that is seen,35 then “my activity is equally passivity.”36 Conversely, passivity is equally activity; human corporeality intertwined with the rest of “life” is not alternatively active and passive, but both, simultaneously. In passivity, whether in sleep (Merleau-Ponty’s most extreme case) or enacting habits and trained capacities, with or without the assistance of technical devices, power is not dissociated from the body, as Foucault would have it. Rather, what we view as passivity or docility is “a certain variation in a field of existence already instituted, which is always behind us and whose weight, like that of an object in flight, only intervenes in the actions by which we transform it.”37 The apparently passive incorporation of social norms through, for example, disciplined or compliant behaviour, is simultaneously an activity by which those norms and meanings are not only actualised, but also transformed. It is not that some corporeal powers are tamed and biological processes “regularized” and that these coexist with other corporeal forces that remain free and a means of escape. Even in sleep or habit, which are “cluttered with the debris of the past and present,” the body “plays among them.”38 Third, in elaborating how this play of activity and passivity is related to the historicity of human existence (“existence already instituted”), Merleau-Ponty introduces his notion of the “event” that disrupts determinism (whether political, biological, or technical). Here, without re-centring “agency” back upon human conscious intentionality, he nevertheless puts the onus back upon human poles of intercorporeal assemblages to keep the world open for the “event,” and, therefore, as I will shortly argue, for ethics. In his lectures on “Institution in Personal and Public History,” Merleau-Ponty equates “activity-passivity” (which is the closest he gets to an idea of “subject” or “agency”) with the idea of complexes of human-nonhuman life being simultaneously “instituted and instituting.”39 This is decidedly “not a constituting subject,” which would imply that my consciousness constitutes the meaning and value of my world.40 This concept of “institution-instituting” also adds consideration of temporality to activity-passivity—the historicity and futurity of intercorporeal intertwinings. The vortex of experience lived by a human body always involves a past, a tradition, that is, encounters within a social milieu “which sediment in me a meaning” such that I will tend to perceive and respond to my world in a similar way to how I have before.41 Indeed, every level of existence, the “animal,” the “biological,” the interpersonal, carries, from the time of our birth, an element of “existence already instituted,” where “institution” refers to “those events in experience which endow it with durable dimensions.”42 On the other hand, sedimentation is not just meaning surviving as a residue in an activity that repeats the past or that duplicates a social convention. “Institution” also involves beginning something new, initiating, innovation. Every experience involves “a simultaneous de-centering and recentering of the elements in our personal life, a movement by us toward the past and of the reanimated past toward us.”43 In other words, institution itself, “being exposed to …,” or receptivity to elements and significances, initiates the present and simultaneously “opens a future.”44 This is Merleau-Ponty’s idea of the “event,” the break with determinism that opens a gap between past and future and transforms meaning. Being “exposed to …” and “overcome by” that which is not oneself inspires “those events which sediment in me a meaning as the invitation to a sequel, the necessity of a future.”45 This institution-instituting aspect of the thickness, intertwining, and divergence of bodily being prevents me from coinciding with myself, or the present with past and future, or me with the other in any form. It is within this “divergence” of “sense” and “flesh,” this “deformation, which is proper to institution,” that “a future,” new concepts, and therefore new paths for thinking and living arise.46 This intercorporeal opening of “a future” is the basis for ethics.

#### Reject the aff’s discourse: this is a prerequisite to evaluating the normative and political content of their argumentation.

Pylypa 98 Jen Pylypa “Power and Bodily Practice: Applying the Work of Foucault to an Anthropology of the Body” Arizona Anthropologist #13: pp. 21-36, ©1998 <https://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/110194/1/azu_gn1_a785_n13_21_36_w-ocr.pdf> JW

Michel Foucault coined the term "biopower" to refer[s] to what he viewed as the dominant system of social control in modern Western society. He argued that over the past few centuries, Europe has witnessed a decrease in coercive mechanisms of control such as military force, and an increase in social control through individual self-discipline. His conception of modern power was novel in that it contrasted with existing models that conceptualized power as "domination", that is, as a centralized and repressive force exerted by one group over another--a "possession" which could be acquired and imposed on others through physical coercion. Rather, he described power as dispersed throughout society, inherent in social relationships, embedded in a network of practices, institutions, and technologies--operating on all of the "microlevels" of everyday life. "Biopower", Foucault asserted, operates on our very bodies, regulating them through self-disciplinary practices which we each adopt, thereby SUbjugating ourselves. Its force derives from its ability to function through "knowledge and desire"-the produc[e]tion of scientific knowledge which results in a discourse of norms and normality, to which individuals desire to conform. Individuals thus voluntarily control themselves by self-imposing conformity to cultural norms through self-surveillance and self-disciplinary practices, especially those of the body such as the self-regulation of hygiene, health, and sexuality.

#### The debate space is uniquely key to challenge harmful discourses.

Shanahan 93 William Shanahan (Ft. Hays State University, Kansas) “kritik of thinking” Debater's Research Guide, Health Care Policy, 1993 <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Shanahan1993HealthCare.htm> JW

Policy has a stranglehold on debate worthy of any NYC transit cop. Argument must conform to rigid policy prescriptions - not only are particular types of arguments deemed unacceptable, whole ways of thinking are excluded also. A caveat must follow on the heels of these seemingly scathing denunciations of current debate practices: debate is excellent! Debate opens paths of thinking that compulsory statist education maliciously denies. Intellectual obedience to authority is schooled, beginning in kindergarten and continuing throughout the remainder of the students' captivity (3). Debate teaches students to question the dogma spewed forth daily in their classrooms, to inquire into the matter at hand rather than simply accept the intellectual authority of their teachers. Students initially are protected from the stultifying effects of educational institutionalization by the argument and thinking skills learned in and brought from debate. Unfortunately, debate cannot resist its own calls to "face reality," cannot resist its own dogma. In debate though, those calls rally around the policy pole, demanding allegiance to the real world. Debate has opened many paths for its participants and helped them to travel extraordinarily far. This article attempts to open additional pathways for debaters, not shut down the current ones.

### A2 Policymaking

#### No internal link between plan text and solvency—voting aff doesn’t make gun control a reality and political gridlock in congress proves a total handgun ban is a fantasy. The kritik aims to change the agency of debaters to better align their mindsets with what could be a set of constructive policies so I come prior.

#### Discourse analysis precedes normative and political discussion.

Bleiker Roland Bleiker (Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland) “Discourse and Human Agency” Contemporary Political Theory 2003

‘It is within discourse,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘that power and knowledge articulate each other.’ The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be though, talked and written in a normal and rational way. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, slected, organized, and diffused by certain procedures. This processs creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59-60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rations – and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. They cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

### K Good

#### Debate is a polyvocal activity-we must be able to question whether it is good to believe in something, even if it has been proven rationally justified. This specific conception of education comes first and outweighs theory.

Koh and Niemi 15 Ben Koh and Rebar Niemi (debate coaches) “How Do I Reach These Kids?: An Affirmation of Polyvocal Debate” NSD Update September 15th 2015 <http://nsdupdate.com/2015/09/15/how-do-i-reach-these-kids-an-affirmation-of-polyvocal-debate-by-ben-koh-rebar-niemi/> JW

It is not a question of excluding the chaos or even controlling it, but understanding the value in hearing the clash of multiple voices. For nowhere else in school are we given the vibrant opportunity to be as real in the academic space as is in debate; where we are able to read multiple arguments from multiple views from multiple bases. We must encourage debate to be an outlet for the chaotic and doubtful elements of our beliefs for it’s an opportunity to bridge debate’s separation from the real world into our own world. Our lives aren’t always smooth unwavering stories. They are often a chaos that is hard to grasp outside the lens of community. Polyvocal debate is inclusive and encouraging of this chaos, of the hard questions and life changing moments of realization. A form of debate that acts as if it can omit doubt is not a true form of debate at all. This isn’t just an argument for “unique educational value” in the banking-sense. Debate should not be thought of as an esoteric extracurricular designed to spice up the resume. Paradigms of debate that stop at the moment of rational justification treat the issue of what world we create for ourselves as an unnecessary step, but this conversation is what must happen in our lives and further what must happen in debate. Polyvocal debate allows for this discussion. We should not just ask “is deontology true” but further “is it good for me to believe in deontology” or util or contractarianism, etc. Rationality cannot be trusted to judge itself, but abandoning logic altogether isn’t necessary just yet. It is too easy to take up one side or the other (only truth matters or only the good matters). Debate is harder. The tenets of logic and justification can create questionable conclusions, and a truly valuable form of debate must allow us to criticize and reevaluate these conclusions to live our lives to the fullest. We must be able to ask if beliefs empower or disempower our lives. We always have the power to ask should we believe it or is it correct, and exercising this capacity is the practice of debate. There are two ways in which we can understand and consider what we ought to believe – what is rationally justifiable, and what is good for us to believe for ourselves. In our lives we cannot just ask “what do I think is true.” We must always end up asking “is it good for me to believe in what I believe?” This is how we must act in our own lives outside of just the debate space. When we are faced with a difficult situation be it in our personal lives, work, etc., we are inevitably going to be confronted with moments of seemingly undeniable hopelessness; where despite our best efforts and our thinking, we cannot justify or rationally see a way to be happy or push ourselves through to the other side. Is it good for me to believe that no matter what I will do, that I will get a bad grade in this class? Is it good for me to believe that I will fail in my work? Is it good for me to believe in hopelessness? Our answer is no. Our answer is that debate helps you learn new questions as well as new answers. Again and again we’ve heard the articles and arguments that collapse everything to the old questions: education versus fairness, the rules versus innovation and expansion, correct ways of being versus incorrect ones. Bizarrely there are some who like to play with the same questions forever, perpetually flipping bits between one and zero, never writing new code. We are tired of these questions. Perhaps they would be enlivened by new voices. Polyvocality is the necessary and explosive generation of new questions. The practice of debate is an educational activity because it is generative and interrogative of voices. Use it for what it’s used for. Education can be praxis – where the abstraction of theory becomes lived abstractness inside the fabric of everyday experience. Where a radical new way of thinking-feeling the world become possible. Where you don’t just learn about quantum physics, but cry at how beautiful the expression of quantum interactions can be and feel blessed to be a part of them, and then teach them to your friends and family. But this is only part of what education is. Education is a becoming that is necessarily political. Often times it is anti-reactionary or anti-conservative, not because it includes some biased political position, but because it is impossible to actually experience learning without it changing you – what you think is right and wrong, what you want to do, and who you think of yourself as. On our view, this makes education necessarily anti-fascist (where fascism is defined as the tendency to over-represent and prefer certain ways of being to others based on normative, intuitive, or ontological claims). No matter your petty political affiliations, too many people in our world must attempt escape everyday, live as targets, suffer, and experience domination. If education is not a force to help us address this, it is not a properly empathetic education. Even if the educational space of debate allows for slightly more opportunities to escape the everyday and find new connections and places to dwell, this is a greater benefit to everyone than any obedience to respectability politics, norms of conduct, or “correct ways of being” could ever achieve. This is how the world works. We should not abandon the cause of empathy just because we can have that elsewhere. It’s not as if we should not care about others at certain times because we do so in others Debate is foundationally about empathy. Arguments are only persuasive in the ability for their to be foster a shared experience of understanding. Judges vote for arguments that have a particular effect on them – the effect of “being convincing.” Arguments that win send the judge on a path of becoming-convinced. In order for this to happen, the debater must actually get through to the judge on some level, whether intuitively, emotively, via rhetoric, the flow, or explanation. The best debating promotes empathy. Not empathy defined by biased terms – empathy defined by actual contact with actual others, perspectives, and ways of expressing oneself. It is not that young people are in need of moral training or must be told what is right and wrong or that debate should erase and conquer disagreement. Rather, it is that we should strive to learn to live with disagreement. For it is too simple and brute to believe in a monovocal system of thought – that your language is the only Rosetta Stone to translate the world through. Debate must be a place to see how to live with ourselves and live among others. If being the better debater means being the worse person, we should NOT endorse this conception of better debating. There is no value to improving a debate related skillset that is not bracketed by being caring and affirming of the world. The argument against education [and], methodology, and performance debates is that these will somehow sacrifice an essential part of what makes debate debate. This perspective is entirely wrongheaded. What a polyvocal understanding of debate underscores is that what makes debate is multiple voices. Our belief is that it is possible to promote incredible skill, learning, and growth in students and be better debaters while at the same time being better people. Debate is a field where participants of all kinds create real experiences and real change. Students have the ability to speak their individual truths and have real academic and personal conversation about what creates, sustains, and restricts their worlds – and if the current “rules of debate” do not allow for that, we advocate breaking those rules.

#### Deciding the better debater is inherently educational-we should promote good practices.

Niemi 15 Rebar Niemi (debate coach) comment on “The Role of the Judge” NSD Update September 4th 2015 <http://nsdupdate.com/2015/09/04/the-role-of-the-judge-by-david-branse-part-one/> JW

You first seem to have an extremely impoverished view of education. My position is that in voting for the better debater, we reinforce some conception of what “better debating” is. If this is not the case, then we are likely not voting for the better debater. Moreover, that in and of itself is educational (through losing people become better debaters by learning what they should not do). So in that case, a discussion of what debate should be is fundamental to voting for the better debater. I find it hard to believe that better debaters could say, be racists. Racists seem like worse debaters. Similarly, I find it hard to see how better debaters could be [or] exclusively male. Gender bias seems to not select the better debater. Granted my views here are politically and culturally influenced – perhaps that’s why the notion of better debating itself (and therefore the “rules” of the activity) need to be up for debate. Up for debate by the participants themselves, not a proxy, overlord, or boss. Each debater should have the opportunity to define what it means to be a good debater for them. If they can convince a judge that their definition of better debating is the one that should be used in a round, who is the judge to disagree? My answer would be simple: a judge who intervenes in favor of their own personal beliefs.

#### Be skeptical of their widely exclusive debate model. They’re biased by ideological preferences.

Overing 15 Bob Overing “ON ALL-ENCOMPASSING DEBATE WORLDVIEWS” September 5th 2015 Premier Debate Today http://premierdebatetoday.com/2015/09/05/on-all-encompassing-worldviews/ JW

There is no widely accepted extrinsic model for debate. Debate is not a simulated legislature or a philosophy colloquium. It’s not a social justice activist meeting or a journal’s editorial board. It’s not a chess game, and it’s not a rules committee. It’s just debate. And one of the best things about debate just being debate is that we get to decide what it means. The Emporia State University team that won the NDT two-and-a-half years ago argued that debate can and should be a “home” for everyone. In his written ballot for that debate, critic Jordan Foley latched onto “home” as “the multiplicity of ways individuals relate to debate.” Every debate can be different, and you can make debate a home for you whether you’re a judge, coach or competitor. There’s something very appealing about the empty home: Debate is exactly what we make of it. When we take a step back and get into this mindset, the battle lines dissolve. You might prefer a particular style of debate, be it continental philosophy or comparing statistical methodologies, but to argue that the other side has no claim to what debate means is arrogant and selfish. Presumption lies with the permutation here, not mutual exclusivity. So I’m calling out argumentative exclusion on every level — I’m calling out judges who won’t vote on X argument they just don’t like, debate theorists who say only Y paradigm has it right, and debaters who will avoid arguing Z at all costs. What reasons do you have that should override a presumption for inclusion and openness? Are they good reasons? Are they so good that you should define away the parts of debate you don’t like? Your ideology restricts the way you can see debate. We all have our idiosyncratic preferences. Some might be better than others, and we can argue about them! I’m all about that. But I’m not about defining debate to the exclusion of the opposition. Because debate has no definition. It’s just debate.

### A2 Theory

#### Debate is a rigged game to protect oppressive power structures-your enforcement of rules feeds into this mode of thought.

Spanos 11 William V. Spanos (distinguished professor of English and Comparative Literature at the SUNY Binghamton) “Interview Questions” September 15th 2011 kdebate <http://kdebate.com/spanos.html> JW

The reason I asked you that question is because I've always thought that the debate system is a rigged process, by which I mean, in your terms, it's framed to exclude anything that the frame can't contain and domesticate. To frame also means to "prearrange" so that a particular outcome is assured," which also means the what's outside of the frame doesn't stand a chance: it is "framed" from the beginning. It was, above all, the great neo-Marxist Louis Althusser's analysis of the "problematic" - the perspective or frame of reference fundamental to knowledge production in democratic-capitalist societies -- that enabled me to see what the so called distinterestness of empirical inquiry is blind to or, more accurately willfully represses in its Panglossian pursuit of the truth. Althusser's analysis of the "problematic" is too complicated to be explained in a few words. (Anyone interested will find his extended explanation in his introduction --"From Capital\* to Marx's Philosophy" -- to his and Etienne Balibar's book \*Reading Capital\*. It will suffice here to say that we in the modern West have been \*inscribed\* by our culture --"ideological state apparatuses (educational institutions, media, and so on)-- by a system of knowledge production that goes by the name of "disinterested inquiry," but in reality the "truth" at which it arrives is a construct, a fiction, and thus ideological. And this is precisely because, in distancing itself from earthly being --the transience of time --this system of knowledge production privileges the panoptic eye in the pursuit of knowledge. This is what Althusser means by the "problematic": a frame that allows the perceiver to see only what it wants to see. Everything that is outside the frame doesn't exist to the perceiver. He /she is blind to it. It's nothing or, at the site of humanity, it's nobody. Put alternatively, the problematic -- this frame, as the very word itself suggests, \*spatializes\* or \*reifies\* time -- reduces what is a living, problematic force and not a thing into a picture or thing so that it can be comprehended (taken hold of, managed), appropriated, administered, and exploited by the disinterested inquirer. All that I've just said should suggest what I meant when, long ago, in response to someone in the debate world who seemed puzzled by the strong reservations I expressed on being informed that the debate community in the U.S. was appropriating my work on Heidegger, higher education, and American imperialism. I said then -- and I repeat here to you -- that the traditional form of the debate, that is, the hegemonic frame that rigidly determines its protocols-- is unworldly in an ideological way. It willfully separates the debaters from the world as it actually is-- by which I mean as it has been produced by the dominant democratic I capitalist culture --and it displaces them to a free-floating zone, a no place, as it were, where all things, nor matter how different the authority they command in the real world, are equal. But in \*this\* real world produced by the combination of Protestant Christianity and democratic capitalism things -- and therefore their value --are never equal. They are framed into a system of binaries-Identity/ difference, Civilization/barbarism I Men/woman, Whites/blacks, Sedentary/ nomadic, Occidental/ oriental, Chosen I preterit (passed over), Self-reliance I dependent (communal), Democracy I communism, Protestant Christian I Muslim, and so on -- in which the first term is not only privileged over the second term, but, in thus being privileged, is also empowered to demonize the second. Insofar as the debate world frames argument as if every position has equal authority (the debater can take either side) it obscures and eventually effaces awareness of the degrading imbalance of power in the real world and the terrible injustices it perpetrates. Thus framed, debate gives the false impression that it is a truly democratic institution, whereas in reality it is complicitous with the dehumanized and dehumanizing system of power that produced it. It is no accident, in my mind, that this fraudulent form of debate goes back to the founding of the U.S. as a capitalist republic and that it has produced what I call the "political class" to indicate not only the basic sameness between the Democratic and Republican parties but also its fundamental indifference to the plight of those who don't count in a system where what counts is determined by those who are the heirs of this quantitative system of binaries.

#### Evaluate as strength of link question—you could have engaged so the kritikal benefits come first.